

Shakespeare Association of America 2013
Session on Shakespeare and Hospitality
Convened by David Goldstein and Julia Reinhard Lupton

ABSTRACTS

“Here’s a Strange Alteration!”: Hospitality, Friendship, and Sovereignty in *Coriolanus*
Dr. Thomas Anderson, Mississippi State University

I hope to forge a relationship between absolute hospitality, as that which requires no invitation and is subject to no laws or limitations, and friendship in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*. Specifically, I hope to show that the Roman play offers an affirmative politics imagined in the portrayal of the intimate encounter between Aufidius and Coriolanus in act 4. The scene of absolute hospitality between the two warriors destabilizes friendship as a political force at the same time that it suggests its liberating potential. More precisely, Coriolanus’s new relationship with Aufidius radically re-conceptualizes the logic of friendship common in the early modern period, suggesting that the play disrupts the communitarian space imagined in the classical rhetoric of friendship. In reconfiguring classical notions of friendship common during the early modern period, Shakespeare makes the case that sovereign absolutism is, in fact, nourished by friendship characterized by consensus and fraternity. *Coriolanus*, by contrast, represents a concept of friendship fraught with division and violence. More specifically, the play’s representation of a politics of friendship, exemplified in the scene of hospitality between Aufidius and Coriolanus, redistributes the force of sovereign absolutism by disrupting community in favor of division, disagreement, or, according to the play, “perpetual spoil” (2.2.119). My focus on the constitutive condition of friendship’s failure as a sustainable force that shapes political sovereignty in *Coriolanus* is to suggest that the play’s commitment to a politics of friendship as a counter to failed republicanism generates an agonism that precludes rapprochement and establishes rejected friendship, or absolute hospitality, as the critical force against Roman state absolutism.

Cosmopolitanism and Sacrifice in *The Merchant of Venice*
Dr. Kevin Curran, University of North Texas

Emmanuel Levinas and Immanuel Kant offer the two most famous formulations of hospitality within the philosophical tradition. Though both are premised on a relationship between selfhood and Law, the two accounts are striking, above all, for how fundamentally different they are. Levinas thought of hospitality as an absolute, pre-contractual duty we all bear the Other. This is a form of hospitality—like the Biblical hospitality of Lot—rooted in sacrifice and selflessness, and for Levinas it represented a powerful alternative to the egocentrism of ontology. Kant, on the other hand, describes what he calls “cosmopolitan hospitality,” defined as “the right of a foreigner not to be treated with hostility.” This version of hospitality develops out of Kant’s sense that the maintenance of a nationally and ethnically diverse commercial life—one defined by the constant arrival and departure of “visitors”—is essential to ensuring peace and stability in an increasingly global political world. Kantian hospitality, based on rights rather than obligation, is hospitality for the individual. It presupposes the sort of rational, unified self native to the

liberal tradition of political and legal thought, and it's about as far from Lot and Levinas as one can get. My SAA paper reads *The Merchant of Venice* within this context as a case study in what we might call "Shakespearean hospitality," a theatrical iteration of the larger philosophical tradition and one which, I suggest, hosts a unique encounter between Kant and Levinas. Presenting social scenes that are both self-deprecatingly sacrificial and contractually cosmopolitan in turn, *The Merchant of Venice* asks us to think of hospitality in pluralistic terms, as a spectrum of socio-symbolic acts that extend from the ambit of absolute obligation to the ambit of rights and entitlements.

Threatened Hospitality and Anxieties of Religious Conversion in *The Three Ladies of London* and *The Merchant of Venice*
Fatima Ebrahim, University of Western Ontario

When Conscience asks Hospitality whether any strangers are invited to dinner in Robert Wilson's allegorical play, *The Three Ladies of London* (1584), Hospitality emphatically replies in the negative. Lloyd Kermode has argued that Hospitality's exclusion of foreigners is representative of the English attitude to reject any influence that might corrupt the "hospitable house" (65). And to corrupt a hospitable house, of course, will consequently threaten the host's faith, since, "hospitality is simply *Christian*" (68). Critics have suggested that *Three Ladies* is a probable source for *The Merchant of Venice*, and that the Hospitality-Usury relationship anticipates the one between Antonio and Shylock. In *Three Ladies* Hospitality is eventually slain by Usury and the implication is that the foreigners' effect on the economy is to blame for the demise of hospitality in England. Like Usury, Shylock also attempts to wield his knife on Christian hospitality (Antonio), but this threat, I argue, is based primarily and significantly on religious terms rather than economic ones.

Shylock threatens to corrupt the "hospitable house" of the Venetian Christians by threatening his opponent's faith itself. I argue that Shylock's intention to execute the "merry bond" is to forcibly convert Antonio to Judaism. James Shapiro and Janet Adelman, among other critics, have made a similar argument but they focus on circumcision to explain why Shylock takes a knife to Antonio. Instead, I hope to show that Shylock treats Antonio like an animal to be butchered according to Jewish ritual slaughter laws (*shechita*), whereby the bond's stipulation, "nearest the merchant's heart" (4.1.233), I contend, is the throat to be cut in the same way that Usury slits Hospitality's throat (2.1029). In doing so, I join the many critics who have sought to account for the prevalence of food imagery in *Merchant* (one critic has counted at least 23 times when someone is invited to a meal or refers to eating). By arguing that Shylock attempts to forcibly convert Antonio via Jewish dietary laws, I hope to demonstrate that religious conversion or intersections of Christians with non-Christian others is articulated through the trope of food and hospitality.

Hospitality and Salt-Cellars in Renaissance Drama: Thomas Middleton's *Your Five Gallants*
Victoria Jackson, Shakespeare Institute

This paper looks at the relationship between salt-cellars and Renaissance drama from a material perspective that uses Middleton's *Your Five Gallants* (1608) as a case study. Salt – a substance which provides indispensable nutrients to the human and animal body and acts as a preservative for other life-sustaining foodstuffs - has long been associated with friendship and companionship. In G. P. Valeriano's account of the symbolism of salt in his *Hieroglyphica* (1595), he asserts that salt was symbolic of friendship because of the substance's permanency – it does not spoil or go stale - and its ability to protect and preserve. He writes that salt 'was usually presented to guests before other food, to signify the abiding strength of friendship. Wherefore many consider it ominous to spill salt on the table.' The vessels that contained salt, known as salt-cellars or salts, became what many people have argued to be the most important items on the Renaissance table. They occupied a conspicuous physical position on the table, placed in front of the person regarded as most important or with the highest social standing. Consequently, the social status of each guest was indicated by their proximity to the salt-cellar. But more than being a marker of hierarchy, salt were also physical materializations of identity and hospitality.

The salt's functions can be theorized through Alfred Gell's concept of 'distributed personhood' which - building on his theory of objects as social agents - suggests that decorated objects can be viewed as physical embodiments of the people that used them. Salts then are physical materializations of the identity and hospitality of the owner or host, where his hospitality is materially expanded or disseminated out through a system of objects. The salt itself possesses agency to mediate social relationships at the table. Shakespeare and contemporary authors used salts and other dining objects to construct scenes of hospitality in imaginative literature. In a scene in Middleton's *Your Five Gallants*, a salt-cellar is stolen from a table before a meal takes place. The scene satirizes the assertions of social status and value, and subverts the expectations that have been established by the social rules which surrounded the salt. This analysis demonstrates that the ideals of domestic conduct presented in polemical forms found in some dramatic texts can be important sources for the study of the social codes of domestic objects.

“The true, rare, and accomplish'd monster, or miracle of nature”: Hospitality among the spongy natures

Dr. Justin Kolb, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Ben Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour* opens on the raging poet and Jonson proxy Asper, gripped by "*furor poeticus*," vowing that, "with an armed and resolved hand, / I'll strip the ragged follies of the time / Naked, as at their birth" (Ind.16-18). Asper complains of the "abuse of this word humour" (Ind.80). He proceeds to describe humour "as 'tis *ens*,

a quality of air or water,
And in itself holds these two properties,
Moisture and fluxure: as, for demonstration,
Pour water on this floor, 'twill wet and run:
Likewise the air, forced through a horn or trumpet,
Flows instantly away, and leaves behind

A kind of dew; and hence we do conclude,
That whatsoe'er hath fluxture and humidity,
As wanting power to contain itself,
Is humour. So in every human body
The choler, melancholy, phlegm, and blood,
By reason they flow continually
In some part, and are not continent,
Receive the name of humours. (Ind.88-102)

Asper's definition is a useful shorthand for the popular understanding of the Galenic humours in early modern England. The body is a "Spongy Nature," composed of disparate organs messily sopping up and wringing out the four humours and the various influences—ranging from the stars to tobacco to the fancies of the imagination—that acted upon them.

I am interested in hospitality as it is practiced among such spongy creatures. What sort of society could such creatures form? What state must one's body attain before it can safely open itself to others without losing its own humour? What happens to hospitality when it is recast into Asper's epidemiological language of hygiene, infection, and pollution? Starting with the above definition from *Every Man Out of His Humour*, this paper will look at hospitality through the lens of the humours and examine how spongy bodies are made more or less hospitable to various malign and beneficial influences. I intend to especially focus on the baseless jealousy of Thorello in *Every Man In His Humour* (Q1) and the similar jealousy of Othello as examples of the risks an open a hospitable body and household could pose to one's affected humour, resulting in humiliation, loss of self-control, or worse. How does hospitality disrupt the self-conscious continence and reserve demanded by Galenic medicine, and how do plays attempt to make sense of these disruptions? How does hospitality strip away affected performances of self? What will be revealed underneath?

Hospitality and Hypocrisy in *Timon of Athens* **Laura Kolb, University of Chicago**

Timon of Athens in many ways a portrait of hospitality gone wrong: Timon opens his home to his friends, and he supports his lavish gift-giving and feasting with debt. His friends, who are also his creditors, profit from his generosity without intention of reciprocating. The hypocrisy of these friends is repeatedly figured in terms of abuse of hospitality. One friend "ne'er drinks,/ But Timon's silver treads upon his lip"; another "has my lord's meat in him" even as he turns away a request for help. Flavius, Timon's steward, reminds his creditors' servants of their masters' two-facedness: "When your false masters eat of my lord's meat/ Then they could smile and fawn upon his debts." This paper investigates the intertwined discourses of hospitality and hypocrisy in *Timon of Athens*, examining their importance to the play's form and looking at the text's engagement with the wider discussion of hospitality, oeconomy, debt, and sociability in early modern English culture.

The break in Timon's character that divides the play into "two firmly contrasted parts" (as G. Wilson-Knight put it) is also a dividing line between two visions of hospitality: the one

idealizing, the other deflating. Towards the end of the first banquet scene, Timon imagines himself and his friends inhabiting a golden world of infinite reciprocity: “We are born to do benefits: and what better or properer can we can our own than the riches of our friends? O, what a precious comfort ’tis, to have so many, like brothers, commanding one another’s fortunes!” Later, outside of Athens, he is as inhospitable as someone living outdoors can be - and misanthropic railing fixates on hypocrisy (“Promise me friendship, but perform none” he demands of Alcibiades). He describes gold as an agent of universal falseness, making “black white, foul fair.”

The change from Timon’s vision of wealth facilitating a community of “like brothers” to his misanthropic railing against a social world universally falsified by the desire for gold has traditionally been understood in terms of the play’s engagement with the shift from feudalism to capitalism, or from communality to self-interest. I suggest that the tension between liberality and self-interest could not easily be sorted into an “old” and “new” poles. Looking at the play alongside practical handbooks – like Tusser’s *Five Hundreth Points of Good Husbandry* and Henry Wilkinson’s *Debt Book* – this paper suggests that the play dramatizes the conflicted intersections of social and economic relations in matters of debt, gift-giving, and liberality by placing issues of hypocrisy and hospitality at the center of both the “philanthropic” and “misanthropic” portions of the play.

“The Nobleness of Life”: Pagan Worlds in Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra*
Dr. Sean Lawrence, University of British Columbia, Okanagan

Famously, Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra* alternates between two different worlds. Rome labours under an obsession with male honour, military virtue, and manly stoicism, while an epicurean dedication to pleasure and a female ruler herself dedicated to pleasure govern Egypt. “In the east,” remarks Antony, “my pleasure lies,” but power and military reputation lie in the west, where Antony serves as a triumvir of Rome, and enjoys a reputation elevated by survival from starvation. On stage, both worlds express their values by consumption and elaborate acts of hospitality. The triumvirs express their brief solidarity with Pompey by drinking together in an all-male, all-night party aboard his ship. The canons of hospitality overrule even Pompey’s ambition when he refuses to kill his guests, although this would leave him, as Menas the pirate promises, “lord of the whole world.” For their parts, the Egyptians feast with competitive enthusiasm. Even Cleopatra’s death is surrounded by imagery of breast-feeding and associated with figs. Much criticism repeats the debate within the play itself between two incompatible visions of the good life, that of warlike virtue and that of hedonistic pleasure, with many critics effectively bracketing one of the title characters, to implicitly claim that Shakespeare praises or sympathizes with the other.

I argue, however, that Shakespeare locates sociality neither in war nor in self-indulgence, but in the Christian era, anticipated in Octavius’s declaration that the “time of universal peace is near.” The two worlds of Antony and of Cleopatra represent alternative forms of paganism. Both fail, as though inevitably. The alliance created between the triumvirs barely outlasts their hangovers.

Antony explodes in rage at Cleopatra's suspected perfidy at least three times, despite all their partying together. The play portrays alliances built on exchanges of hospitality, on sharing food or even sex, as basically unstable. By its references to "Herod of Jewry" and to a coming time of peace, moreover, the play locates such social orders in a pre-Christian past.

"Hospitality in Twelfth Night: Playing at (the Limits of) Home"

Dr. Joan Pong Linton, Indiana University

This essay applies Tracy McNulty's theorization of the hostess in an analysis of inhospitality in *Twelfth Night*, as epitomized by Olivia's household, headed by a cloistered countess. In the absence of a male head, Olivia's house is overrun by male dependents all too eager to serve as substitutes, turning the lady of the house into property up for grabs. Within this context, my analysis focuses in on the first meeting between Olivia and Viola disguised as Cesario, in which they quickly fall to playful mockery of hospitality and courtly rituals, a process that culminates in Olivia's unveiling of her face to Cesario/Viola. This face-to-face encounter resonates on several cultural registers. First, it allows Olivia to mock the lady's role as cypher in the courtly blazon as well as her own position as property, having little ownership within the household. Second, the encounter links Olivia to two biblical subtexts that locate household and hospitality within a larger socio-political arena. The first is the story of Susanna and the Elders (specifically the public unveiling of Susanna at her trial), with Susanna's acute awareness of victimization reflecting on Olivia's situation. The second is the Pauline anticipation of seeing God face to face, with its message of love informing the worldly practice of hospitality. Finally, the mock theatrics framing the encounter undoes host and guest positions, making for a moment in which two women play at the limits of home and hospitality, normatively conceived and practiced. Within their improvised play, each brings "home" the stranger as an anagrammatic version of herself. Realized in the moment for a moment, this co-production of home and hospitality implicates theater in its interstitial practice: imagining the possible for which there is as yet no recognizable space in social practice.

'The Emperor of Russia was My Father': Foreign Queens and the Sources of Royal Hospitality

Dr. Sandra Logan, Michigan State University

In Act 3, scene 2 of Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*, Hermione asserts

The Emperor of Russia was my father:
O that he were alive, and here beholding
His daughter's trial! that he did but see
The flatness of my misery, yet with eyes
Of pity, not revenge! (3.2.117-20)

Hermione's invocation of her provenance as the daughter of the Emperor of Russia (3.2.117) emerges when her husband Leontes, king of Sicily, threatens her with death for her supposed transgression of adultery with his childhood friend Polixenes, King of Bohemia. Her lament, that her father might "but see the flatness of my misery . . . with eyes / of pity, not revenge!" (3.2.119-21) suggests the potential threat of her father's power, now lost, which might have transformed Hermione's royal husband from ally into enemy. Even under the duress of Leontes' scathing accusations, she does not outwardly wish that her father were available to offer a violent intervention, but instead wishes only for his cognizance of her vulnerability as the victim of a vicious and antagonistic spouse and king. That he can no longer respond to his daughter's situation with either pity or vengeance intensifies Hermione's isolation, while emphasizing the protection implicitly afforded to any foreign queen by her family's capacity for martial and/or diplomatic influence. As the daughter and sister of potent rulers, she is nevertheless subject to her royal husband's whims and judgments, and even to his exclusion of her from the polity to which she has been bartered. The invocation of her dead father illuminates the delicacy of her situation as Queen of Sicilia – she is a foreign queen in an inhospitable environment, reduced to the state of exception, her value as a wife, mate, and mother violently denied, the security provided by her familial affiliations no longer available for solace or support. This paper explores the conditions of inhospitableness underlying the thin veneer of hospitality in both Sicily and Bohemia. Focusing on Hermione as the abused 'queen of another country' (a reference to the title of my larger project), I consider both what it means to live as an exile in the state of marriage, separated from friends, family, home, language, and all resources of support, and how this play situates women from foreign locales as the bearers of an otherwise absent sense of hospitality in the courts of Europe. Performed at the wedding of the Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine, this play offers a dark, disturbing portrayal of women's struggle to navigate the shoals of a foreign court, and of the failures of hospitality under the conditions of patriarchal monarchy and marriage.

"Let me not stay a jot for dinner": Hospitable Times with Shakespeare
Dr. T. J. Moretti, Iona College

To the extent that theater companies hosted London theatergoers at playhouses, hospitality was necessarily lacking: no food, no flourish, no gifts, no bed, no refuge (cue cutpurses), and, at least at the Globe, poor shelter. Nevertheless, theater companies could be hospitable so long as they helped audiences pass the time. Time perceptions and the affects of time are key features of early modern English hospitality. And yet, certain of Shakespeare's plays are often inhospitable precisely because they force audience members to dwell on excruciating moments of violence, loss, and grief. Lear never gets his dinner, and it seems we wait for a long time to go home to ours. This paper investigates some crucial ways that Shakespeare adjusts tempo to gratify theater guests no less than to vex them. At one moment, he accelerates dramatic action and poetic output to heighten theatrical affect and to delight audiences; just as suddenly, he slows tempo to gauge how much empathy, or even ennui, theatergoers can tolerate.

The implications of this paper are three-fold. First, it adds to critical discussions about the benefits and concomitant vulnerabilities of hosts and guests (*hospitēs*)—as Derrida puts it,

“hospitality, hostility, *hostpitality*.” Second, it brings Henri Bergson’s understanding of time and duration to bear upon hospitality and early modern English theatricality. Third, it emphasizes that one of Shakespeare’s key theatrical projects was and is to make the theater inhospitable enough to accommodate insight, depth, and awareness. *King Lear* is the textual crux for this paper because it signals to us what Shakespeare would have us endure.

Stretching Hostility and Hospitality in *Measure for Measure*
Dr. Tripti Pillai, Coastal Carolina University

My paper discusses unsightly and unhealthy hospitality in *Measure for Measure*. In particular, I focus on the processes by which all characters in the play are hosts to what I refer to as “diseased guests,” that is, to guests who, in violating the limits of social conduct and venue, stretch the sites of hostility and hospitality and render them indistinguishable from each other through rhizomatic flows of exchange.

My argument in the paper and my readings juxtapose Deleuze and Guattari’s theories of “deterritorialization” with Gaston Bachelard’s “poetics of space.”

Leave husbandry sleeping: the other time of hospitality in Thomas Tusser’s *Hundreth good pointes of Husbandry*
Jessica Rosenberg, University of Pennsylvania

In the 1573 edition of his ever-expanding *Fiue hundreth points of good husbandry*, Thomas Tusser interrupts his advice for the month of December to introduce “A digression to hospitalitie.” This break in the regular progression through the calendar is accompanied by a break in the work’s otherwise continuous formal composition: the poems that follow (which first appeared in the edition of 1570) digress from the 4-line rhyming “points” preceding them, from the work’s procession from month to month, and from the volume’s repeated endorsement of storage, accumulation, and thrift. The poems emphasize the importance of giving to the poor and opening one’s home during these often barren months, pairing these ethical instructions with reminders of the fragility of life and inevitability of death (winter is, after all, “a nipper of all thing in eury age.”) This paper will consider Tusser’s depiction of Christmas hospitality as a “digression” from the regular time of husbandry on each of these registers (formal, calendrical, and economic), reflecting on their intersections both in the volume itself and more broadly. Crucially, the short poems that appear in this section are presented typographically and generically in the style of a lyric miscellany, as if the *Pointes* have turned for the holidays from their regular progression of couplets to another genre entirely – one that formally plays out the principles of generosity and hospitality espoused in the poems themselves (including “A description of apt time to spend” and “Against fantastical scruplennesse.”) Tusser is distinctly aware, however, that this time can only ever be exceptional: as he begins the advice for January immediately following, “When Christmas is done, kepe not Christmas time still: / be mindfull of rering, and loth for to kill”(sig. Bii^v.)

Drawing on Tusser's ambivalent conception of "thrift," my paper will explore some of the ways that the temporalities of spending and saving are rewritten by this material disruption of both book and household. Finally, I'll consider what perspective the untimeliness we see essentially attached to thrift and to ritual in this example might offer on Hamlet's objection to another kind of untimely thriftiness at the beginning of that play ("Thrift, thrift, Horatio, the funeral baked meats/Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables"(1.2.179-80).

Macbeth's Hospitable Carcass

Dr. David Ruiter, University of Texas at El Paso

My current project on Shakespeare and Hospitality deals specifically with Shakespeare's texts in relationship to the later works of Jacques Derrida, including *Of Hospitality* (2000), *The Gift of Death* (1992), and *Acts of Religion* (2001).

My SAA essay will focus on the issues of hospitality and hostility within the context of *Macbeth*. In this play, the ethical turn is decisively from the hospitable to the hostile, and the result is a constitutionally damaged, even uglified, version of the role of host, as seen most clearly in the porter's hellish welcome, Duncan's destroyed and absent body, and the uninvited Banquo's attendance at Macbeth's failed feast. Emphasizing Derrida's understanding of the known dangers inherent to the hospitable relationship, Macbeth, maybe not so ironically, meets his end within his own home—the head of the household beheaded inside the very domain he ultimately fails to master.

That said, my project here deals not so much with a living hospitality, as with the habit or business of hospitality, devoid of ethical life, what we might see as a sort of hospitable carcass, much like Duncan's body. In hopes of calling attention to the special issues of hospitality that this play particularly addresses, I will focus, initially, on events early in *Macbeth* that demonstrate the difference between the hospitable performance of selfish business and the other-directed ethics of hospitality, before moving on to address how the economic shift away from such ethics and towards notions of business and security impacts upon the play's conclusion.

"At home, abroad, at this man's house": Translation and the Thresholds of Hospitality in William Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money*

Kathryn Vomero Santos, New York University

In his *Defense of Poesy*, Sir Philip Sidney asks, "What is it...against law of hospitality, to jest at strangers, because they speak not English so well as we do? What do we learn?" In this paper, I take Sidney's question as a starting point as I examine the relationships among language, translation, and hospitality in William Haughton's 1598 play *Englishmen for My Money*, a city comedy that draws much of its humor from the French, Dutch, and Italian strangers who "speak not English so well as" the Londoners who host them. Although Haughton's play takes its audience into historically multilingual spaces such as the Royal Exchange and St. Paul's, the majority of the play's linguistic action unfolds in relation to the London home of Pisaro, a Portuguese-born merchant. Pisaro and his three marriageable (and half-English) daughters who

dwell inside his home become figures for competing practices of translation as they offer and deny hospitality to the strangers who attempt to cross their domestic, linguistic, and bodily thresholds. By bringing Haughton's play into conversation with Derrida's *Monolingualism of the Other* and Paul Ricoeur's formulation of translation as "linguistic hospitality," I aim to address the following questions: Is translation an exercise in hospitality (and vice versa)? Is hospitality contingent upon the ability to communicate in a common language? Answering these questions will allow me to show that the contact between speakers of different languages brings a renewed understanding to the observation that the words "guest" and "host" share a common root.

Eating with the Sidneys: Hospitality at Penshurst **Dr. Amy Tigner, University of Texas at Arlington**

Ben Jonson's "To Penshurst," a country-house poem frequently taught in the college classroom, exemplifies Renaissance literary *digestio* of classical forms: of Horace's celebration of country life; of Virgil's georgics; and even of Juvenal's and Martial's satire. And we often ask our students to study Jonson in light of his classical forebears, but, as much as Jonson is interested in the digestion of literary forms in this poem, he is also interested in the ingestion of food. Indeed, for Jonson, Penshurst is primarily a place to eat: deer, sheep, bullocks, kine (cows), calves, conies (rabbits), pheasant, partridge, carps, pikes, eels, cherries, plums, figs, grapes, quinces, apricots, peaches, apples, pears, nuts, capons, rural cakes, cheeses, beer, bread, and wine. The sheer number of delectable foods that populate the poem and fill the table invites critical speculation about the significance of such comestible abundance. In his seminal biography of Jonson, David Riggs considers the poem and its emphasis on Lisle's board as part of an elaborate exchange between the poet and the patron (183-86). Other scholars have interpreted Jonson's indulgent eating in "To Penshurst" as a instance of Rabalaisian carnivalesque: Anne Brumley reads the poem along with Epigram 101 ("Inviting a Friend to Supper") as "dialogic, participating in the spirit of misrule" (225). Some have considered Jonson's hyperbole of abundance in light of the fantastic: Bruce Thomas Boehrer views the poet's depiction of the estate as a pastoral fantasy, "a sort of agrarian Disney World: a magic kingdom replete with fauns, satyrs, and enchanted corses" (Boehrer 99). Robert Appelbaum interprets the poem as part of the Land of Cockaigne tradition, a utopic "fantasy of feeding and being fed" (Appelbaum 119). I propose, alternatively, that we take seriously Jonson's image of abundance as a way of investigating the material realities of food practices of production, of preparation, of hospitality, and consumption at early modern rural estates. This approach to the poem demonstrates a relationship that is intimately connected through practice, revealing an interdependent materiality rather than a symbolic representation of the estate and its hospitality.

Shakespeare's Messmates **Dr. Julian Yates, University of Delaware**

'Messmate' is the word Donna Haraway uses to bring home to readers the transformative effect of modeling our world as a set of relations between companion or multi-species. "*Companion*

comes from the Latin *cum panis*, ‘with bread,’” she writes, “messmates at table are companions.” Eating with configures and delimits communal boundaries. Beyond questions of those non-human animals said to belong to human households today under the rubric of the “pet,” or those dogs, sheep, cows, pigs, and goats that had names in early modern households, Haraway’s model of the messmate extends beyond anthropic or anthropomorphic models of cooking and cuisine. For her the human genome serves as a material-semiotic archive of our shared historical association with plant and animal actors of all kinds. In its non-communitarian or non-integrative mode, “messmate” includes the polities of bacteria to which our bodies play host and which, in the event of our deaths, will flower and feast upon us; viral actors for whom our bodies serve as ‘kitchens.’ At its most extreme, the figure provincializes culinary practices as keyed to somatic and psychic regimens, rendering them shelters from a generalized non-anthropic cooking. The grave, as Hamlet observes to Claudius, by this logic, constitutes a second sitting—this time for worms that feast on us. The ‘raw,’ as it turns, out, will be ‘cooked’ but *we* might name that non-anthropic ‘cooking’ death and decay.

My aim in this essay is to explore the figure of the kitchen in Shakespeare’s plays, modeling the kitchen-to-table relays imagined in non-anthropic terms or with an eye to the flows of matter (plant, animal, mineral) directed into human households. I am interested in those moments in plays when the transformative processes of the kitchen are put to dramatic use—either in reference to those spaces in a house or locales given over to cooking or by the use of such texts kitchens produce, and the way these serve as places to think about the limits of inclusion drawn around who eats and what is eaten. Key plays include: *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (which includes much report of “kitchening”); *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2* (in which the genre of the dietary becomes a rubric for forms of stage business as sovereign Hal toys with his companion species the Commons); and *The Tempest* in which locavore Caliban’s table constitutes a closed circuit set against Prospero’s re-educative culinary endeavors.